

said earlier, I think we have a constitutional obligation to do it. A member of my staff has been saying this, Ryan Keating, no one likes to be the bad parent. No one likes to be the one who comes in and says, You know what, you're grounded. You're not doing this right, to be the enforcer. It would be nice to always be nice but someone has got to question what is going on here because we are losing lives, we are losing people because of these misjudgments. And then this Chalabi who gave us all this information on how great the war was going to be, and that was another one, we were going to be greeted as liberators, not occupiers. We are 800 dead later, most of that happening after we have toppled Saddam and the statue was pulled down.

Now everyone is saying that this Chalabi, well, we never really worked with him. We knew him, we talked to him, but we get advice from everybody. He was sitting up in the Chamber when the President gave his State of the Union address, right behind Mrs. Bush.

I do not like to be the bad parent. I do not have kids. I am not a parent in any sense. But I think the point is well taken that somebody has to say, what is going wrong here, and I think there is a growing frustration among the American people. It is not just Democrats. It is not just Democrats. It is the frustration that I think you see when we see the President's hometown newspaper editorializing against him I think is a pretty good sign that people better start shooting straight. The problem is you cannot put the bullet back in the gun. The bullet is out of gun. We have got to make the best of a bad situation and work with our soldiers to make sure that we do not lose any more of them while they are over there.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, let me correct myself. It is one of the home State newspapers in Dallas. I know that the American people associate the President with Crawford, Texas. Let me just say very quickly that we encourage the e-mails that we have been receiving. The gentleman can give our e-mail address out and then I will give another e-mail address out, but the gentleman from Ohio can go ahead and do that. David Letterman has his Top 10. You have the e-mail. I am going to give out this e-mail address so I do not want to take that away from the gentleman.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. This is mine. This is my role.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. This is your role.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. You are not going to take it away from me?

Mr. MEEK of Florida. No, sir.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. 30 Something Working Group. Send us an e-mail. 30SomethingDems@mail.house.gov.

Send us an e-mail. We would love to hear from you. We would love to hear what you have to say. We have to continue to have these discussions. Again, as we started, this is not personal. We

need, you and I hopefully in our own little way, to raise the level of debate here to say it is not venomous, it is not malicious, it is not personal. We do not mean to personally attack anybody, but there are some real policy concerns. In a time of war, I think we have even more of a responsibility to do it.

Mr. MEEK of Florida. In closing, I just want to say that our next 30 Something hour will be on Tuesday, July 6. That is after Independence Day which is going to be a festive celebration, I understand, here in Washington, D.C. There will be fireworks on the Mall to celebrate our independence once again. They can check the Web site which is the Democratic Leader Web site, democraticleader.house.gov/ 30something to get that information. I would also like to commend the WWE which is our wrestling component here, World Wrestling Entertainment, for their voter registration effort of the 18 to 30 demographics.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4548, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-561) on the resolution (H. Res. 686) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4548) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 2100

SANCTUARY CITY POLICIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, we have had an interesting discussion for the last hour on the issue of security of the homeland and whether or not our efforts in Iraq are on track, whether or not we are doing the right thing. It is intriguing to me to listen to this discussion for a variety of reasons because, regardless of whether or not anyone believes that our efforts in Iraq are right and honorable and good, I have yet to meet anyone who believes that the need to defend the homeland from terrorist attack is not greater than it has ever been.

One may disagree entirely with whether the decisions made by the President have been appropriate; but no one says, no one has dared to say that we should do anything but aggressively pursue policies that are designed to make us more secure from terrorists

who we know are out there, whether or not they conspired with the Iraqi Government, with Saddam Hussein, or whether or not our efforts in Iraq will lessen that particular threat. The reality is we know we have a threat and we know that we should be doing everything possible to, in fact, defend ourselves against that threat. That is a given. No one argued it.

Now, amazingly, Mr. Speaker, a couple of days ago I brought forward to the floor of the House an amendment to the Homeland Security Appropriations Act, and I have to give just a little bit of background to help explain exactly what the amendment was all about because there are people who are perhaps viewing this tonight who really are not sure. But let me explain that Members of the Congress knew exactly what this was all about.

There are, in fact, a number of cities and States around the country that are pursuing policies that we describe as sanctuary city policies. In the case of a State, the State of Maine is contemplating and actually has proposed that they become a sanctuary State. What does that mean? Sanctuary from what? Sanctuary from investigation by the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement. Because there are cities, there are localities that are saying that they will not allow their police forces, for instance, to, in fact, report the arrest or the detention of anyone who is here illegally. They will not allow their police force to report that to the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement because there is a desire to eliminate the category of illegal immigrant from the whole lexicon. And so this is happening throughout the country.

Why is this significant? In 1994, the Congress of the United States passed a law, and the law said that no city or State could, in fact, impede the flow of information to the Bureau, which then it was INS, or from the INS so that we could be helped, the Federal Government could be aided, in our efforts to try to control illegal immigration. That is on the books. I was not even in the Congress of the United States when that particular proposal was accepted and passed into law. But it is the law. That is the given. We have a law that says that they cannot hide these people, that no State or city can provide sanctuary for people who are living here illegally; but, of course, the unfortunate aspect of that particular law is that it did not include any penalty provision.

So cities and States are doing it. They are doing it all over the country, and they are doing it to the detriment not just to the security of the United States of America but to the security of their own people in cities and States where these things are in place because we have seen cases where people who are here illegally and who had been arrested in the past for being here illegally, but not turned into the Bureau of Immigration Control and Enforcement, were then allowed to go back on